



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,273	04/13/2001	James R. LaDine	12800-003001	4611
26161	7590	01/07/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			BORIN, MICHAEL L.	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/835,273

Applicant(s)

LADINE ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Borin

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 and 22-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 22-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Response to restriction requirement filed 09/29/03 is acknowledged. Applicant elected, Group I, claims 1-18, 22-28. Claims 19-21, drawn to non-elected group are canceled. Claims 29-37 are added. Claims 1-18, 22-37 are pending.

Newly submitted claims 29-37 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The invention of claims 29-37 is drawn to a system for mass spectrometric analysis that can be used for different processes, such as analysis of other peptide or other biological samples. Accordingly, claims 29-37 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1631

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-18, 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Patterson (US Patents 5869240 or 5827659) or Chang et al (US 4507555) or Wang et al. (Database Caplus DN:133:101503 Combinatorial Chemistry and High Throughput Screening (1999), 2(6), 327-334), or Demirev et al. (Database Caplus, DN 127:155996 Analytical Chemistry (1997), 69(15), 2893-2900).

The instant claims are drawn to method of analysis of plurality of proteins obtained from a biological system after stimulation of the system with a biological agent. The method comprises steps of separating multiple protein samples, analyzing them with parallel mass spectrometry and correlating mass spectrometry data as a function of time.

Parallel mass spectrometry is well known analytic technique developed in response to the need of analyzing multiple samples, biological samples, protein samples among them, in particular. See, e.g., Patterson (see, e.g., last paragraph of Background section), or Chang et al. or Wang et al. or Demirev et al.

Art Unit: 1631

Therefore, it would be *prima facie* obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention is made to apply parallel mass spectrometry to any problem requiring simultaneous measurement of plurality of biological samples, such as, for example, measurement of plurality of protein samples. Further, it would be obvious to use parallel mass spectrometry to analyze plurality of protein samples to characterize response of biological system to a stimulus, which is a routine application of this analytical tool in biochemical analysis.

If there are any differences between the dependent claims Applicant's claimed method and that of the prior art, the differences would be appear minor in nature. Although the prior art do not teach all particular combinations of limitations of the method as claimed, selection of optimal parameters would be conventional and within the skill of the art of analytical biochemistry.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (703) 305-4506. Dr. Borin can normally be reached between the hours of 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST Monday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Woodward, can be reached on (703) 308-4028. The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 305-3014.

Serial Number: 09/835273

Page 5

Art Unit: 1631

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

December 29, 2003

MICHAEL BORIN, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

mlb

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Michael Borin', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.